

Appl. No. 10/666,188  
Arndt. Dated 2 November 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of 2 August 2005

#### **REMARKS**

This RCE is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on 2 August 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed 12 October 2005. In these Actions, claims 36, 37, and 39-47 were rejected under 35 USC §102 (b) as being anticipated by Hughes (U.S. Patent No. 5, 754,622).


Applicant continues to respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 36, 37, and 39-47 under 35 USC §102 (b) as being anticipated by Hughes. In an effort to provide make more explicit what was implicit from the "limit the incident radiation" on the detector language, Applicant has amended the independent claims 36, 44, and 45 to explicitly indicate that the adjustment is coordinated relative to the radiation detector position. Further support for the amendment can be found in Applicant's specification paragraphs 30 and 33, for example.

As stated in Applicant's previous response, Hughes merely teaches **irradiating only a specific area in the anatomy**, without exposing other areas to a substantial amount of radiation, and is completely devoid of any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion about *limiting the radiation at the detector* as is recited in the independent claims 36, 44 and 45. As also stated in Applicant's previous response, Applicant, therefore, reiterates that **prior approaches which limit radiation on the patient do not "necessarily" include synchronized adjustments of the aperture geometry to limit the incident radiation on the detector as claimed.**

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 36, 44 and 45 define allowable subject matter over the applied art. Claims 37, 39-43, depend directly or indirectly from claim 36, and claims 46 and 47 depend directly or indirectly from claim 45 and hence are similarly allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and allowance of the claims 36, 37, 39-47 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Ann M. Agosti  
Reg. No. 37,372  
General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A66  
One Research Circle  
Niskayuna, New York 12309  
Telephone: (518) 387-7713